



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/809,981

03/26/2004

David R. Adaskin

10030938-1

9631

22878 7590 10/09/2008

AGILENT TECHNOLOGIES INC.
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION,LEGAL DEPT.
MS BLDG. E P.O. BOX 7599
LOVELAND, CO 80537

EXAMINER

GORDON, BRIAN R

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1797

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/09/2008

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

IPOPS.LEGAL@agilent.com

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed July 1, 2008 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant asserts Shchegrova does not disclose the step of selecting a printhead assembly. Applicant arguments are not commensurate in scope with that of the claims. Applicant asserts a printhead assembly is defined as being made up of one or more printhead groups, each printhead group being made up of one or more printheads, and each printhead containing nozzles, or dispensers. However the claims do not define a printhead assembly as such. The claim broadly recites a printhead assembly comprising a printhead. As such any "assembly" including a printhead may be considered a printhead assembly. The frames of Shchegrova include dispensers (printheads) as such the frame may be considered a printhead assembly.

Furthermore the broad step of selecting a printhead assembly comprising a printhead, is inherent when an operator simply chooses (selects) to use a device (including a printhead) such as that of Shchegrova.

Applicant asserts the reference does not disclose the step of entering printhead-related data. It should be noted that the step only requires data from one of the parameters of the group. One broad parameter is "type" of printhead. Applicant admits the reference discloses a step of entering a best non-error dispenser. The "best non-error" dispenser is a "type" of dispenser that is distinguished from other dispensers.

In view of such, the previous rejection is hereby maintained.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

4. Claim 9 recites the limitation "said printhead" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The previous claims do not positively recite that more than one printhead is required.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 19 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 17. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k). There is no structural difference in the computer readable mediums. Both include a program with the steps of claim 1. The only difference is the intended use of the program on the medium.

6. Claims 11-16 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Applicant is required to cancel the claim(s), or amend the claim(s) to place the claim(s) in proper dependent form, or rewrite the claim(s) in independent form. As to claim 11, applicant appears to attempt to claim a biopolymer array. However the claim does not

Art Unit: 1797

include a transitional phrase or any structural limitations to determine what elements define the biopolymer array. It should be noted that the process by which a device is made is not considered to be structurally limiting. Distinctions between an apparatus claim and prior art must be based upon structure.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. Claims 1-17, 19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Shchegrova et al. US 2003/0143329.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention “by another,” or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Shchegrova et al. discloses a method, apparatus, and computer program products useful in fabricating a chemical biopolymer arrays. The apparatus may include

a head system, transport system, and a processor. The head system has multiple groups of drop dispensers. The transport system moves the head system with respect to a substrate. The processor dispenses drops from dispensers during operation of the transport system, in a pattern along a selected path for each group (abstract).

Biopolymers are typically found in biological systems and particularly include polysaccharides (such as carbohydrates), and peptides (which term is used to include polypeptides, and proteins whether or not attached to a polysaccharide) and polynucleotides as well as their analogs such as those compounds composed of or containing amino acid analogs or non-amino acid groups, or nucleotide analogs or non-nucleotide groups. [0024]

As described in Figure 8 the process includes a step of choosing a frame with the most non-error dispensers (830) from among the available frames. It will be appreciated that any criteria other than middle dispensers, could be used for selecting a first set from among those frames which equally qualify as having the most non-error dispensers. All of the frames selected to this point may then be examined (860) to see if each set has a working dispenser in at least one frame. Since frame Y was selected as the first frame and it has an error dispenser D_{y10} , this is not true. Therefore, a frame is selected (870) from among remaining frames which has the highest number of non-error dispensers in sets not containing a non-error dispenser in previously selected frame (selecting printheads based on type and number of dispensers). At this point, the previously non-selected frames are W, X, and Z. [0042]

In a further step a best non-error dispenser is then selected (890) from among the Y and X frame dispensers in each of the foregoing sets using the pre-loaded into a memory 141 or manually entered by an operator criteria based on any one or more of size, location, or shape of a deposited drop, and the result stored in a memory (such as memory 141 in FIG. 9). [0044]

Operator input device 312 may, for example, be a keyboard, mouse, or the like.

Processor 140 has access to a memory 141, and controls print head system 210 (specifically, the activation of the ejectors therein), operation of the transport system, operation of each jet in print head system 210, capture and evaluation of images from the camera 304, and operation display 310 and speaker 314. Memory 141 may be any suitable device in which processor 140 can store and retrieve data, such as magnetic, optical, or solid state storage devices (including magnetic or optical disks or tape or RAM, or any other suitable device, either fixed or portable). Processor 140 may include a general purpose digital microprocessor suitably programmed from a computer readable medium carrying necessary program code, to execute all of the functions required of it as described below. It will be appreciated though, that when a "processor" such as processor 140 is referenced throughout this application, that such includes any hardware and/or software combination which will perform the required functions.

Suitable programming can be provided remotely to processor 140, or previously saved in a computer program product such as memory 141 or some other portable or fixed computer readable storage medium using any of those devices mentioned below in

connection with memory 141. For example, a magnetic or optical disk 324 may carry the programming, and can be read by disk reader 326. [0049]

Arrays may be read by any other method or apparatus than the foregoing, with other reading methods including other optical techniques (for example, detecting chemiluminescent or electroluminescent labels) or electrical techniques (where each feature is provided with an electrode to detect hybridization at that feature). Results from the reading may be raw results (such as fluorescence intensity readings for each feature in one or more color channels) or may be processed results such as obtained by rejecting a reading for a feature which is below a predetermined threshold and/or forming conclusions based on the pattern read from the array (such as whether or not a particular target sequence may have been present in the sample, or whether or not a pattern indicates a particular condition of an organism from which the sample came). The results of the reading (processed or not) may be forwarded (such as by communication) to a remote location if desired, and received there for further use (such as further processing). [0056]

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian R. Gordon whose telephone number is 571-272-1258. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 1st Fri. Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Brian R Gordon/

Application/Control Number: 10/809,981
Art Unit: 1797

Page 9

Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1797